

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants have carefully considered this application in connection with the Examiner's Action and respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

The Applicants originally submitted Claims 1-10 and 21-30 in the application. The Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 21. Accordingly, Claims 1-10 and 21-30 are currently pending in the application.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-10 and 21-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2, 4, and 6-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Williamson. As the Examiner is no doubt aware, determination of obviousness requires consideration of the invention considered as a whole; the inquiry is not whether each element exists in the prior art, but whether the prior art made obvious the invention as a whole. Furthermore, there must be some suggestion or teaching in the art that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the claimed invention; a reference that teaches away from a claimed invention strongly indicates nonobviousness.

Moreover, to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on Applicants' disclosure.

The Examiner has asserted that "Williamson discloses the claimed invention except for stating that the springable winding is 'biased to unwind . . .'" The Applicants respectfully direct to Examiner's attention to FIGUREs 3 and 5a of Williamson that teach a *longitudinal* springability of two interleaved helical windings compressed along the longitudinal axis of the coil(s). (Col. 2, Lines 55-57 and 60-62) Further, Williamson teaches the longitudinal springability biasing the terminus against an *inside* of the magnetic core. (FIGURE 5a) This is shown and described in FIGURE 3 which is "a side elevational view of the expanded helical winding ... in accordance with the [Williamson] invention," and FIGURE 5a which is "a side elevational view ... showing [sic] two stacked *compressed* coils." [Emphasis added] (Col. 2, Lines 55-57 and 60-62)

The Applicants have amended Claim 1 to more clearly recite that the springability of the springable winding is *rotational around* the longitudinal axis of the springable winding and that the springability further biases the terminus against the *underside* of the magnetic core. Williamson, therefore, fails to teach or suggest the invention recited in independent Claim 1 and the dependent Claims 2-10, when considered as a whole.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 21-23, and 25-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Williamson in view of Japanese Patent No. JP 56012714 to Takasaki. Regarding independent Claim 21, the Examiner asserts that Williamson discloses the claimed invention except for the convex portion of the core half. However, as recited above, Williamson fails to teach or suggest the rotational springability and biasing the terminus against a bottom surface of the magnetic core recited in independent Claim 21.

Williamson, individually or in combination with Takasaki, fails to teach or suggest the invention recited in independent Claims 1 and 21 and their dependent claims, when considered as a whole. Claims 1-10 and 21-30 are therefore not obvious in view of Williamson and Takasaki.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the cited references do not support the Examiner's rejection of Claims 1-10 and 21-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicants now see all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-10 and 21-30.

It is not believed that any fees are due for this communication, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any possible fees connected with this communication to Deposit Account No. 08-2395.

The Applicants request the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, P.C.



Richard D. Krobusek
Registration No. 44,851

Dated: Dec. 29, 2004

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800